

UNDEFINABILITY OF STANDARD SEQUENT CALCULI FOR 3-VALUED PARAconsistent LOGICS

STEFANO BONZIO AND MICHELE PRA BALDI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the deductive properties of a family of 3-valued paraconsistent logics. We define a notion of *standard* sequent calculus and prove that there is no sound and complete standard sequent calculus for these logics. Moreover, we provide non-standard sound, complete and cut free sequent calculus for Paraconsistent Weak Kleene Logic using three-sided sequents.

1. INTRODUCTION

Distinguishing between a “strong sense” and a “weak sense” of propositional connectives when partially defined predicates are present in a language is an idea due to Kleene [17]. Each of these meanings is made explicit by introducing 3-valued truth tables, which have become widely known as *strong Kleene tables* and *weak Kleene tables*. By labelling the elements as 0, n , 1, the *strong tables* for conjunction, disjunction and negation are displayed below:

$\wedge$	0	n	1	$\vee$	0	n	1	$\neg$	
0	0	0	0	0	0	n	1	1	0
n	0	n	n	n	n	n	1	n	n
1	0	n	1	1	1	1	1	0	1

The *weak tables* basically differ for the behavior of the third value n and are given by:

$\wedge$	0	n	1	$\vee$	0	n	1	$\neg$	
0	0	n	0	0	0	n	1	1	0
n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
1	0	n	1	1	1	n	1	0	1

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03F03. Secondary 03B50, 03B53.

Key words and phrases. sequent calculus, three-valued logic, paraconsistent logic, multi-sided sequent.

Each set of tables naturally gives rise to two options for building a three-valued logic, according to the choice of 1 (only) as designated value, or 1 together with the third value n . Therefore, four logics populate the Kleene family:¹

- Strong Kleene logic [17, §64] and the Logic of Paradox, LP [19], obtained out of the strong Kleene tables by choosing 1 and $1, n$, respectively, as designated values;
- Bochvar's logic [8] and Paraconsistent Weak Kleene logic, PWK [16, 20], given by the weak Kleene tables choosing 1 and $1, n$, respectively, as designated values.

In the present paper we focus on a family of paraconsistent logics which includes both LP and PWK. We aim at investigating their deductive power by furnishing appropriate sequent calculi. Different types of sequent calculi has been introduced for LP [1], [2], [4], [3], [7]. On the other hand, to the authors' best knowledge, the only attempt to provide a sequent calculus for PWK is [13]. All the existing sequent calculi for these paraconsistent three-valued logics present non-standard features, for instance non standard axioms (it is the case of [4]), logical rules introducing more than one connective [4], [3] or logical rules that can be applied only in presence of certain linguistic conditions (this is the case in [13]). The main result of this work consists of proving the impossibility of providing *standard* sequent calculi for a family of logics including both LP and PWK (see Theorem 19). At the light of the mentioned negative result, we opted for introducing two different non-standard calculi for PWK, one having linguistic restrictions and the other adopting the formalism of multi-sided sequents.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we provide our readers with the necessary background to go through the whole paper. In particular, we review the existing deductive calculi for PWK. In Section 3, we give an appropriate notion of *standard* sequent calculus and prove the impossibility to formulate adequate (sound and complete) calculi for a family of logics, including paraconsistent three valued logics. Finally, in Section 4, we introduce a multi-sided sequent calculus for PWK.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We start by fixing some terms and notation. Given a similarity type ν , the term algebra $\mathbf{Fm}$ of type ν over a countably infinite set X of generators will be called the *formula algebra* of type ν ; its members will be called ν -*formulas* (with ν suppressed when clear from the context) and referred to by $\alpha, \beta, \dots$. A *logic* of type ν is a pair $L = \langle \mathbf{Fm}, \vdash_L \rangle$, where $\mathbf{Fm}$ is the formula algebra of type ν , and $\vdash_L$ is a substitution-invariant consequence relation over $\mathbf{Fm}$. We briefly recall the

¹Here we treat the expression “Kleene family” informally and we do not intend to be exhaustive. There are other logics that could also be considered within the family of Kleene logics, defined by using two or more of these matrices (see for instance [15]).

notion of *logical matrix*, that is a pair $\langle \mathbf{A}, D \rangle$, such that $\mathbf{A}$ is an algebra (of fixed type) and $D \subseteq A$ is the set of *designated values*. Given a matrix $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathbf{A}, D \rangle$, then the *logic defined by $\mathcal{M}$* is the one with the following consequence relation:

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{M}} \alpha \text{ iff for all } v \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{Fm}, \mathbf{A}), \text{ if } v(\Gamma) \subseteq D \text{ then } v(\alpha) \in D,$$

for all $\Gamma \cup \{\alpha\} \subseteq Fm$.

As hinted in the introduction, the Logic of Paradox (LP) can be semantically defined as the logic $\text{LP} = \langle \mathbf{Fm}_1, \vdash_{\text{LP}} \rangle$, where:

- $\mathbf{Fm}_1$ is the formula algebra of type $(2, 2, 1, 0, 0)$, namely, of the type containing the connectives $\wedge, \vee, \neg, 0, 1$;
- LP is the logic defined by the matrix $\langle \mathbf{SK}, \{1, n\} \rangle$, where $\mathbf{SK}$ is the algebra whose universe is $\{1, n, 0\}$ and whose operations are given by the strong tables.

Thus, for every $\Gamma \cup \{\alpha\} \subseteq Fm_1$,

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\text{LP}} \alpha \iff \text{for every valuation } v \text{ on } \mathbf{SK}, v[\Gamma] \subseteq \{n, 1\} \text{ implies } v(\alpha) \in \{n, 1\}.$$

Similarly, Paraconsistent Weak Kleene logic can be semantically defined as done for LP by substituting $\mathbf{SK}$ with the algebra $\mathbf{WK}$, given by the weak tables. This means that, for every $\Gamma \cup \{\alpha\} \subseteq Fm_1$,

$$\Gamma \vdash_{\text{PWK}} \alpha \iff \text{for every valuation } v \text{ on } \mathbf{WK}, v[\Gamma] \subseteq \{n, 1\} \text{ implies } v(\alpha) \in \{n, 1\}.$$

PWK has been thoroughly investigated in [12], where the following characterisation theorem is proved.

Theorem 1 ([12, Thm. 14]). *For all $\Gamma \cup \{\alpha\} \subseteq Fm_1$, $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{PWK}} \alpha$ if and only if there is a finite (possibly empty) subset $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$ such that $\text{var}(\Delta) \subseteq \text{var}(\alpha)$ and $\Delta \vdash_{\text{CL}} \alpha$.*

It is useful to recall that the algebra $\mathbf{WK} = \{0, n, 1, \wedge, \vee, '\}$ is an example of *involutive bisemilattices* (for details we refer directly to [9], [10]), whose bisemilattice reduct fails absorption: for this reason, the two binary operations $\wedge, \vee$ induces two different partial orderings.

The only existing Hilbert-style calculus for PWK, HPWK, has been introduced in [9]. It is based on the following axioms:

- A1.** $(\alpha \vee \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$;
- A2.** $\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha \vee \beta)$;
- A3.** $(\alpha \vee \beta) \rightarrow (\beta \vee \alpha)$;
- A4.** $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow ((\gamma \vee \alpha) \rightarrow (\gamma \vee \beta))$;
- A5.** $(\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightarrow \neg(\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta)$;
- A6.** $\neg(\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta) \rightarrow (\alpha \wedge \beta)$;
- A7.** $\alpha \rightarrow 1$;
- A8.** $0 \rightarrow \alpha$,

and its only derivation rule is a restricted version of classical Modus Ponens, namely:

$$(RMP) \frac{\alpha \quad \alpha \rightarrow \beta}{\beta} \quad \text{provided that } \text{var}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{var}(\beta).$$

There is nothing special about the choice of the set of axioms A1-A8: one can just choose any set of axioms that together with the standard rule of Modus Ponens yields to Classical Logic.

As already mentioned, the only existing proof-theoretic analysis of **PWK** is the work by Coniglio and Corbalan [13]. They introduce a sequent calculus, $\mathcal{H}$, whose main feature is the presence of linguistic restrictions on logical (classical) rules.

Axiom

$$\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$$

Structural rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta} LW \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha, \Delta} RW \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} Cut$$

Operational rules

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha, \Delta}{\Gamma, \neg \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta} L_{\neg} \quad \frac{\Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg \alpha, \Delta} R_{\neg} \\ \frac{\Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \Gamma, \beta \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, \alpha \vee \beta \Rightarrow \Delta} L_{\vee} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha, \beta, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \vee \beta, \Delta} R_{\vee} \\ \frac{\Gamma, \alpha, \beta \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, \alpha \wedge \beta \Rightarrow \Delta} L_{\wedge} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha, \Delta \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \beta, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta, \Delta} R_{\wedge} \\ \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha, \Delta \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, \alpha \rightarrow \beta \Rightarrow \Delta} L_{\rightarrow} \quad \frac{\Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \beta, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta, \Delta} R_{\rightarrow} \end{array}$$

Provisos

- : For $L_{\neg}$: $\text{var}(\{\alpha\}) \subseteq \text{var}(\Delta)$
- : For $L_{\wedge}$: $\text{var}(\{\alpha, \beta\}) \subseteq \text{var}(\Delta)$
- : For $L_{\rightarrow}$: $\text{var}(\{\alpha, \beta\}) \subseteq \text{var}(\Delta)$

The linguistic restrictions are motivated as to block inferences as $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \alpha$, which are not valid in **PWK** (we refer to [13] for further details).

It shall be pointed out that sequents are defined on sets, hence the rule of contraction is implicit. Therefore, the calculus $\mathcal{H}$ is nothing but the standard Gentzen style calculus for classical propositional logic with linguistic restrictions. The antecedent and the consequent of a sequent are finite sets of formulae and they are read in the usual way, namely $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ is intended as the metalinguistic conjunction of the formulas in Γ entails the (metalinguistic) disjunction of the formulas in Δ .

3. LIMITATIONS OF STANDARD GENTZEN CALCULI

$\mathcal{H}$ is an example of a sound and complete sequent calculus for $\mathbf{PWK}$. However, its strength is limited by the linguistic restrictions imposed on some logical rules. A question naturally arises: is it possible to give a standard sequent calculus where no linguistic restrictions on rules comes into play? In order to provide a (negative) answer to the above question we shall first introduce a precise notion of *standard* sequent calculus.

Definition 2. A *standard Gentzen calculus* for a logic L is a calculus (on multisets) having the following properties:

- (1) Axioms shall be only of the form $\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$, for any propositional variable α .
- (2) The premises of logical rules must contain only *subformulas* of the conclusion and each logical rule must introduce exactly one connective at time.
- (3) Logical rules must have no linguistic restrictions.
- (4) Sequents shall be interpreted in the object language, that is: $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ means that the formula $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \delta_i$, with $\delta_i \in \Delta$ follows from the formula $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m \gamma_j$, with $\gamma_j \in \Gamma$.
- (5) Only standard structural rules, i.e. contraction, weakening and cut are (possibly) allowed.

The above notion of standard calculus is similar to the one of *canonical calculus* introduced by Avron in [2], with the exception that we are also taking into account linguistic restrictions and the interpretation of sequents (conditions 3,4 in Definition 2).

3.1. $\mathbf{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}$. We start our investigation on possible standard calculi considering the $\{\wedge, \vee\}$ -fragment of $\mathbf{PWK}$, which we refer to as $\mathbf{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}$. This corresponds, roughly speaking, to the logic of distributive bisemilattices, algebras originally introduced by Płonka [18].

Condition 4 in Definition 2 regulates the interpretation of sequents. This naturally implies that the only possible (logical) rules for left conjunction ($L\wedge$) and right disjunction ($R\vee$) must be of the form:

$$\frac{\Gamma, \alpha, \beta \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma, \alpha \wedge \beta \Rightarrow \Delta} L\wedge \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha, \beta, \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \vee \beta, \Delta} R\vee$$

We do not assume anything on the remaining logical rules for conjunction and disjunction.

Remark 3. The symbol $\Rightarrow$ cannot be interpreted as any of the two partial orders induced by the algebra $\mathbf{WK}$. Indeed $\Rightarrow$ can not coincide with $\leq_{\wedge}$, as the designated value n is the bottom element with respect to $\leq_{\wedge}$. Similarly, $\leq_{\vee}$ cannot be such candidate, as any inference of the form $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, where $\bigwedge \Gamma = n$ and $\bigvee \Delta = 1$ does not preserve the considered order.

Remark 4. At the structural level we cannot allow the presence of left Weakening. The reason is that the calculus shall prevent the derivability of the sequent $\alpha \wedge \beta \Rightarrow \alpha$ (as $\alpha \wedge \beta \not\models_{\text{PWK}} \alpha$) which necessarily reduces to $\alpha, \beta \Rightarrow \alpha$, given the above introduced rule ($L\wedge$).

Lemma 5. *In any standard Gentzen calculus for $\text{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}$, the rule for $R\wedge$, i.e. a rule whose conclusion is $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \wedge \beta$ is sound only if it contains both $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha$ and $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta$ among other possible premises $P_1, \dots, P_n$.*

Proof. Via valuations-checking. ■

With this at hand, we can state a negative result for $\text{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}$.

Theorem 6. *Let a standard Gentzen calculus for $\text{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}$ be sound, then it is incomplete.*

Proof. Suppose to have a sound standard Gentzen calculus for $\text{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}$. Then, by Lemma 5, the calculus possess a rule $R\wedge$ with at least two premises of the form $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha$ and $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta$. Then, the only possible derivation of the valid sequent $\alpha \wedge \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta$ (clearly $\alpha \wedge \beta \models_{\text{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}} \alpha \wedge \beta$) terminates in the following form:

$$\frac{\frac{\alpha, \beta \Rightarrow \beta \quad P_1, \dots, P_n \quad \alpha, \beta \Rightarrow \alpha}{\alpha, \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta}}{\alpha \wedge \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \wedge \beta}$$

with $P_1, \dots, P_n$ standing for possible arbitrary premises of any rule $R\wedge$. Recalling that Left Weakening is not admissible (see Remark 4), it follows that the sequent cannot be derived. Therefore the calculus is incomplete. ■

The above reasoning can be clearly extened to the full logic PWK , therefore

Corollary 7. *PWK admits no sound and complete standard Gentzen calculus.*

It is worth noting that, according to the previous considerations, the classical sequent calculus for the $\{\wedge, \vee\}$ -fragment of CL without left weakening is sound with respect to $\text{PWK}^{\wedge, \vee}$. The $\{\wedge, \vee\}$ -fragment of CL corresponds to the logic of distributive lattices [14], and a (distributive) bisemilattice is a distributive lattice where absorption may fail. Therefore, we can observe that, roughly speaking, Left-Weakening cannot play the role of the proof-theoretic counterpart for absorption.

One may wonder whether a slight modification of Definition 2 may lead to a Gentzen style calculus (sound and complete) for PWK . Actually, giving up conditions 3-4 in Definition 2, and thus allowing linguistic restrictions, we have seen in Section 2 that there exists the suitable calculus $\mathcal{H}$. On the other hand, in [3], [4] it is introduced a calculus where condition 1-2 are not fulfilled.

In our view, the only remaining interesting case to analyse is that of giving up condition 4 and interpreting the meaning of sequents in the metalanguage, namely the satisfaction of $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ is, for any evaluation v , if $v(\gamma) \in D$, for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

then $v(\delta) \in D$ for at least one formula $\delta \in \Delta$, where by D we mean the set of designated values. From now on, by *quasi standard Gentzen calculus* we mean a calculus where condition 4 in Definition 2 is replaced by the usual metalinguistic interpretation of the comma in the sequents.

For this new interpretation, we will extend the argument displayed in Theorem 6 to the rules for negation, whose conclusions necessarily are:

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \Delta} L_{\neg} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg\alpha} R_{\neg}$$

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a sound quasi standard Gentzen calculus for PWK. Then any possible $R_{\neg}$ rule must possess at least one premise of the following forms:*

- (1) $\Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta$;
- (2) $\alpha \Rightarrow \Delta$.

Proof. Via valuations checking. ■

Lemma 9. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a sound quasi standard Gentzen calculus for PWK. Then any possible $L_{\neg}$ rule must possess at least one premise of the forms:*

- (1) $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$;
- (2) $\Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta$;
- (3) $\alpha \Rightarrow \Delta$.

Proof. Via valuations checking. ■

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a quasi standard Gentzen sound calculus for PWK. Then:*

- (1) *any possible $R_{\wedge}$ rule must possess (at least) the two classical premises among other possible premises.*
- (2) *any possible $L_{\vee}$ rule must possess (at least) the two classical premises among other possible premises.*

Proof. Via valuations checking. ■

Theorem 11. *Any quasi standard sound Gentzen calculus for PWK is incomplete.*

Proof. We show that the sequent $\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha$ is not derivable in the calculus, i.e. that any possible derivation of such sequent cannot end with axioms. We consider all the possible last steps in the derivation and distinguish three main cases: $\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha$ is obtained by applying $R_{\neg}$, right contraction or cut.

Suppose, as first, that the last rule applied in the derivation is $R_{\neg}$. Then, in virtue of Lemma 8, two cases are possible (sometimes we emphasise the empty antecedent (succedent) with the symbol $\emptyset$):

- (1) The derivation tree contains necessarily a path of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\dots \Rightarrow \emptyset}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow} L_{\neg}}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} R_{\neg}$$

where we have applied also Lemma 9. Such derivation clearly cannot terminate in axioms.

(2) Since $\Delta = \emptyset$, the derivation tree contains necessarily a path of the form:

$$\frac{\alpha \Rightarrow}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} R\neg$$

which cannot terminate in axioms.

Suppose now that the sequent $\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha$ is obtained by applying right contraction, which necessarily imposes that the previous step involved the application of $R\neg$ i.e.

$$\frac{\frac{\cdot}{\cdot} \frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha, \neg\neg\alpha}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} R\neg}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} RC$$

By Lemma 8 we have two cases to consider with many possible subcases:

(1) The derivation tree possesses a path of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha, \neg\neg\alpha} R\neg}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} RC$$

The sequent $\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha$ may be obtained by applying either $R\neg$ or $L\neg$. If the rule $R\neg$ has been applied, then, by Lemma 8, the derivation necessarily contains paths of the forms:

$$\frac{\alpha, \neg\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \emptyset}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} R\neg \quad \frac{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \emptyset}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} R\neg$$

which obviously cannot be reduced into axioms.

On the other hand, if the rule $L\neg$ has been applied then, according to Lemma 9, the derivation contains at least one of the following paths:

$$\frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg \quad \frac{\alpha, \alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg \quad \frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg$$

which basically means that a loop has been produced, so the argument reduces to one of the above treated one.

(2) The derivation tree possesses a path of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha, \neg\neg\alpha} R\neg}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} RC$$

The sequent $\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha$ may be obtained by applying either $(R\neg)$ or $(L\neg)$, so, as before, we shall distinguish the following five subcases

$$R\neg(1) \frac{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \emptyset}{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg$$

This case reduce to 1.

$$R\neg(2) \frac{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \emptyset}{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg$$

This case reduce to 1.

$$L\neg(1) \frac{\emptyset \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg$$

Clearly, this derivation cannot ends with axioms.

$$L\neg(2) \frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg$$

This case reduce to 1.

$$L\neg(3) \frac{\frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha}{\neg\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} L\neg}{\text{This case reduce to 1.}}$$

As last case, suppose $\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha$ is obtained by an application of the cut rule in the following way

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \beta \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha \end{array}}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} \text{cut}$$

By an appropriate application of Lemma 10 it is not difficult to check that, whatever the form of β is, at least one of the two premises of the cut rule cannot be reduced to axioms.

This completes the proof of the Theorem 11. ■

We show that the above limitative results on standard calculi for PWK can be extended to a more general family of logics.

3.2. The main result.

Definition 12. We call $\mathbb{IFL}$ the family of non-trivial logics in the language $\{\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$, where $\rightarrow$ is the material implication ($\alpha \rightarrow \beta := \neg\alpha \vee \beta$), satisfying the following constraints:

- (1) Having the same theorems of classical logic.
- (2) Possessing a negation with a fixed point on a designated value and satisfying $\alpha = \neg\neg\alpha$.

Example 13. The paraconsistent logics in the Kleene family, namely LP and PWK, are two examples of logics in the family $\mathbb{IFL}$.

Remark 14. If $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$ then L is paraconsistent, i.e. $\alpha, \neg\alpha \not\vdash_L \beta$, for any formulas α, β , as it is always possible to find a valuation v sending α to the designated value for which negation acts as a fixed point and β to a non designated value.

Proposition 15. *Let $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$. Then there exists at least a designated truth value k such that k is designated if and only if $\neg k$ is not.*

Proof. By hypothesis, we know that there exists at least a designated truth value n , such that $n = \neg n$. Suppose, by contradiction, that n is the unique designated value of L^2 . L is a logic in the language of CL possessing all the classical theorems. Then, clearly, for any formula α in the language of L , α is a theorem of CL if and only if $\neg\alpha$ is not. Without loss of generality, we assume that α is a classical theorem. Therefore we have, for any valuation v , $v(\alpha) = n$ and $v(\neg\alpha) = \neg v(\alpha) = \neg n = n$, i.e. L is trivial, against the assumption that $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$. Therefore, there exists at least another designated truth value $k \neq n$. If $k = \neg k$, then the above argument applies again. Hence, $k \neq \neg k$. So, as L is non-trivial, then for every

²The argument runs similarly also assuming that the negation is a fixed point on all the designated values.

valuation v , $v(\beta) = k$, for at least some classical theorem β and $\neg k$ cannot be designated. The other direction is proved similarly. ■

Lemma 16. *A logic $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$ can not have a non designated value m such that $m = \neg m$.*

Proof. Suppose that such m does exist, then we will have an evaluation v such that $v(\alpha) = m$, for some formula α . Therefore, $v(\alpha \vee \neg\alpha) = v(\alpha) \vee \neg v(\alpha) = m \vee \neg m = m \vee m = m$, hence that $L \notin \mathbb{IFL}$. In the last passage, we have assumed idempotency of $\vee$, assumption justified by the fact that L must possess all classical theorems. Note that, moreover, if such m exists, L is theoremless. ■

Lemma 17. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a sound standard Gentzen calculus for a logic $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$. Then any possible $R\neg$ rule, whose conclusion is $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg\alpha$, possess at least one premise of the following forms:*

$$\Gamma, \alpha \Rightarrow \Delta.$$

Proof. Any $R\neg$ rule of $\mathcal{S}$ is sound if, whenever the conclusion is false then so is one its (possible) premises $P_1, \dots, P_n$. Falsifying $\Delta, \neg\alpha$ means falsifying $\neg\alpha$, as the context Δ is possibly empty. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is standard, the formula α shall appear at least in one premise. Falsifying $\neg\alpha$ implies that there exists an evaluation v such that $v(\neg\alpha) = k$ for a certain non designated value k . In virtue of Lemma 16, $k \neq \neg k$, then, by Proposition 15, $v(\alpha) = \neg k$ is designated. Therefore the formula α must appear in the antecedent of one of the premises. ■

Remark 18. Any standard Gentzen calculus for a logic $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$ cannot possess the full Right Weakening rule. Indeed if it does, then the sequent $\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \beta$ could be, in principle, derivable. But L is necessarily paraconsistent (by Remark 14) and so the mentioned sequent shall not be derived.

Theorem 19 (The Main Theorem). *Let $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be a standard Gentzen calculus for L . Then, if $\mathcal{S}$ is sound, it is incomplete.*

Proof. Let us assume $\mathcal{S}$ is a sound standard calculus for a logic $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$. Since L has all the classical theorems (Condition 1 in Definition 12), we have $\vdash_L \neg(\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha) \vee \beta$. On the other hand, we have that $\alpha, \neg\alpha \not\vdash_L \beta$. Let us try to derive in $\mathcal{S}$ the corresponding sequent $\Rightarrow \neg(\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha) \vee \beta$. According to Lemma 17, the derivation shall necessarily contain a tree with a branch of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \beta}{\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha \Rightarrow \beta} R\wedge}{\Rightarrow \neg(\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha), \beta} R\neg}{\Rightarrow \neg(\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha) \vee \beta} R\vee$$

where the first and the last step are justified by the assumption that in a standard calculus the meaning of the comma is a disjunction in the consequent and a

conjunction in the antecedent. On the other hand, the application of $R\neg$ is forced, since the sequent $\Rightarrow \neg(\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha), \beta$ cannot be obtained by an application of Right Weakening (see Remark 14). By soundness of $\mathcal{S}$, the above derivation tree cannot terminate with axioms. ■

Corollary 20. *LP admits no sound and complete standard Gentzen calculus.*

A different limitative result is [2, Theorem 3]. The main difference is that our definition of standard calculus presupposes an interpretation of sequents within the object language. Furthermore, we have no need to assume Avron's *coherence condition* [2, Definition 7].

We have seen that PWK admits neither a standard nor a quasi-standard adequate Gentzen calculus. We may wonder whether Theorem 19 can be extended considering quasi-standard calculi.

Remark 21. Notice that Lemma 17 applied also to the quasi-standard case.

Remark 22. The classical $L\neg$ rule is unsound for a logic $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$. This is stated in [2] for three valued logics having two designated values.

Theorem 23. *Let $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be a quasi-standard Gentzen calculus for L . Then, if $\mathcal{S}$ is sound, it is incomplete.*

Proof. Suppose, by contradiction, that $\mathcal{S}$ is complete for $L \in \mathbb{IFL}$. Then clearly, the sequent $\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha$ shall be derived in $\mathcal{S}$. However, by Lemma 17 and Remark 21, the derivation necessarily contains a branch of the form:

$$\frac{\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow}{\alpha \Rightarrow \neg\neg\alpha} R\neg$$

and such branch can terminate in axioms just in case the rule for left negation has a classical premise, which, in virtue of Remark 22, is not sound, against the assumption. ■

4. MULTI-SIDED SEQUENTS FOR PWK

As we are dealing with three valued logics for which we proved the impossibility of furnishing standard sequent calculi (see Theorem 19), a promising way to provide an alternative sequent calculus for both PWK (and LP) is obtained by using 3-sided sequents³. The formalism of multi-sided sequents has been firstly introduced by Rousseau [21] and then developed by other authors (see for example [22],[5], [11], [6]). Let us introduce the definition of 3-sided sequent for PWK.

Definition 24 (3-sided sequent). A 3-sided sequent is an expression of the form $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$, where each Γ_i is a finite, possibly empty multiset of formulae of language of PWK. Intuitively, $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ says that at least one of the formulas

³Here we do it only for PWK but the same idea can be easily extended to LP.

in Γ_0 takes value 0, or at least one of the Γ_n 's takes value n , or at least one of the formulas in Γ_1 takes value 1.

The connection between 3-sided sequents and the truth tables of **PWK** is immediate: as an example, let us introduce the rules for conjunction.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c|ccc}
 \alpha \wedge \beta & 1 & n & 0 \\
 \hline
 1 & 1 & n & 0 \\
 n & n & n & n \\
 0 & 0 & n & 0 \\
 \hline
 \Downarrow
 \end{array} \\
 \frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha, \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \quad \Gamma_0, \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0, \alpha \wedge \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} 0\wedge \\
 \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha, \beta \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \wedge \beta \mid \Gamma_1} n\wedge \quad \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \quad \Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \wedge \beta} 1\wedge
 \end{array}$$

Roughly speaking, the $0\wedge$ rule suggests that the formula $\alpha \wedge \beta$ can be introduced in the 0-component provided:

- (1) Neither α nor β get value n .
- (2) At least one among α and β gets value 0.

Similarly, the $n\wedge$ rule is saying that the formula $\alpha \wedge \beta$ can be introduced in the n -component whenever one among α and β takes value n : this intuitively expresses the fact that the formula $\alpha \wedge \beta$ takes value n whenever at least one among α and β takes value n . In other words, the process of construction of the 3-sided calculus can be seen as an attempt to “embed” truth tables into sequents. In principle, as shown in [22], the process of embedding truth tables into multi-sided sequents can be automatised. Here's the 3-sided calculus for **PWK**, which we will refer to as **PWK**₃⁴.

Axiom

$$\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha$$

where α is a propositional variable.

Structural Rules

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} 0W & \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \mid \Gamma_1} nW & \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha} 1W \\
 \frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} 0C & \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha, \alpha \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \mid \Gamma_1} nC & \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha, \alpha}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha} 1C
 \end{array}$$

⁴For sake of simplicity, the calculus is given for the constants-free fragment of **PWK**.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} \text{Cut}(0, n) \quad \frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} \text{Cut}(0, 1) \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \mid \Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1,} \text{Cut}(n, 1)
\end{array}$$

Operational rulesNegation($\neg$)

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha}{\Gamma_0, \neg \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} 0\neg \quad \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \neg \alpha \mid \Gamma_1} n\neg \quad \frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \neg \alpha} 1\neg$$

Conjunction($\wedge$)

$$\frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha, \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \quad \Gamma_0, \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0, \alpha \wedge \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} 0\wedge \\
\frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha, \beta \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \wedge \beta \mid \Gamma_1} n\wedge \quad \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \quad \Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \wedge \beta} 1\wedge$$

Disjunction($\vee$)

$$\frac{\Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1 \quad \Gamma_0, \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0, \alpha \vee \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1} 0\vee \quad \frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha, \beta \mid \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n, \alpha \vee \beta \mid \Gamma_1} n\vee \\
\frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha, \beta \quad \Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \quad \Gamma_0, \beta \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \vee \beta} 1\vee$$

Definition 25 (Derivability). $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{PWK}_3} \Delta$ if and only if the sequent $\Gamma \mid \Delta \mid \Delta$ is derivable.

The definition of derivability expresses the fact that both 1 and n are the designated values for **PWK**. We give two example-derivations for the reader who is not familiar with multi-sided sequents. We will say that the end-sequent of a derivation is its conclusion.

Example 26. $\vdash_{\text{PWK}} \alpha \vee \neg \alpha$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha}{\alpha \mid \alpha, \alpha \mid \alpha}}{\mid \alpha, \neg \alpha \mid \alpha, \neg \alpha} \quad \frac{\frac{\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha}{\alpha \mid \alpha, \alpha \mid \alpha}}{\alpha \mid \alpha, \neg \alpha \mid \alpha} \quad \frac{\frac{\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha}{\alpha \mid \alpha, \alpha \mid \alpha}}{\neg \alpha \mid \alpha, \neg \alpha \mid \neg \alpha}}{\mid \alpha, \neg \alpha \mid \alpha \vee \neg \alpha} \\
\frac{\mid \alpha, \neg \alpha \mid \alpha \vee \neg \alpha}{\mid \alpha \vee \neg \alpha \mid \alpha \vee \neg \alpha}$$

Example 27. $\alpha \vdash_{\text{PWK}} \alpha \vee \beta$

$$\frac{\frac{\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha}{\alpha \mid \alpha, \beta \mid \alpha, \beta} n, 1W \quad \frac{\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha}{\alpha, \alpha \mid \alpha, \beta \mid \alpha} 0, nW \quad \frac{\beta \mid \beta \mid \beta}{\alpha, \beta \mid \alpha, \beta \mid \beta} 0, nW}{\frac{\alpha \mid \alpha, \beta \mid \alpha \vee \beta}{\alpha \mid \alpha \vee \beta \mid \alpha \vee \beta} n\vee} 1\vee$$

4.1. Soundness, Completeness and Decidability.

Definition 28 (PWK_{G_3}). PWK_{G_3} is the G_3 -version of PWK_3 , namely PWK_{G_3} is obtained by replacing the axiom $\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha$ with $\Gamma, \alpha \mid \Delta, \alpha \mid \Sigma, \alpha$ and omitting structural rules. The notion of derivability is the same given in Definition 25.

From now on, by sequent we mean PWK_{G_3} -sequent and by *propositional sequent* a sequent containing propositional variables only. We now prove some results for the calculus. The strategy of the completeness proof will be useful to provide a countermodel construction.

Proposition 29. *Any PWK_{G_3} -derivation of a the sequent $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ proceeds (bottom-up) by breaking formulae down into sub-formulae and will terminate with leaf nodes which are either axioms or propositional sequents only.*

Proof. By inspection of the rules. ■

Remark 30. A sequent is axiomatic if and only if $\Gamma_0 \cap \Gamma_n \cap \Gamma_1 \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 31 (Satisfaction). An evaluation v satisfies a sequent whenever there is a formula $\alpha \in \Gamma_0$ s.t. $v(\alpha) = 0$ or there is a formula $\beta \in \Gamma_n$ s.t. $v(\beta) = n$ or there is a formula $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$ s.t. $v(\gamma) = 1$.

Proposition 32. *Every non axiomatic propositional sequent is not valid in PWK_{G_3} .*

Proof. A non axiomatic sequent assumes the form $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$; where $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_n, \Gamma_1$ are finite (possibly empty) sets of propositional variables s.t. $\Gamma_0 \cap \Gamma_n \cap \Gamma_1 = \emptyset$. An evaluation v such that $v(\alpha) = n$, for all $\alpha \in \Gamma_0$, $v(\beta) = 1$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma_n$ and $v(\gamma) = 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$ does not satisfy the sequent. ■

Theorem 33 (Soundness). *The system PWK_{G_3} is sound.*

Proof. It is routine to check that axioms are sound and that operational rules preserve soundness. ■

Corollary 34. *The only valid propositional sequents are axiomatic.*

Lemma 35. *If the premise of any rule PWK_{G_3} is invalid, so is its conclusion.*

Proof. Via valuations checking. ■

Theorem 36 (Completeness). *PWK_{G_3} is complete.*

Proof. We need to show that any valid sequent is derivable. For a sequent $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ two cases may arise: either $\Gamma_0 \cap \Gamma_n \cap \Gamma_1 \neq \emptyset$ or $\Gamma_0 \cap \Gamma_n \cap \Gamma_1 = \emptyset$. In the former case, $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ is an axiom thus we are done.

As for the latter case, by Corollary 34, we know that $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ is not a propositional sequent. Therefore, it can be of the following forms (we just deal with a case as all the remaining ones can be carried out similarly):

- 0 $\neg$) $\Gamma_0, \neg\alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ Assume, by contraposition, that the sequent $\Gamma_0, \neg\alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ is not derivable. Then, there exists a (bottom-up) derivation having $\Gamma_0, \neg\alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ as end-sequent and non axiomatic propositional sequents as top leaves whose propositional variables are sub-formulae of the end-sequent in virtue of Proposition 29, which is therefore non valid. By Lemma 35, we have that $\Gamma_0, \neg\alpha \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ is not valid. ■

Remark 37 (Countermodel). A bottom-up derivation terminating with non-axiomatic (propositional) sequents provides a countermodel. Indeed, for at least a non-axiomatic propositional top sequent $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$, a countermodel obtains as follows: for every propositional variable p in $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ and for all i ($0 \leq i \leq 1$) s.t. $p \notin \Gamma_i$, $v(p) = i$ gives a countermodel.

We can univocally identify in a very intuitive way which non-axiomatic sequents provide the desired countermodel. Two main cases may arise:

- (1) Let $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ be the initial sequent such that all the formulas in Γ_1 are propositional variables. The countermodel is given by the non axiomatic propositional sequent such that, for all $\alpha \in \Gamma_1$, it contains α only in the two components $n, 1$.
- (2) Let $\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_n \mid \Gamma_1$ be the initial sequent containing at least a complex (non propositional) formula $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$ ⁵.
 - 2a) $\gamma = \neg p$. The countermodel is defined by the non axiomatic propositional sequent that contains p only in the components $0, n$.
 - 2b) $\gamma = p \wedge q$. The countermodel is defined by the non axiomatic propositional sequent that contains at least one among p, q only in the components $n, 1$ and both p, q in the component n .
 - 2c) $\gamma = p \vee q$. The countermodel is defined by the non axiomatic propositional sequent that contains both p, q only in the components $n, 1$.

Corollary 38. *The system PWK_{G_3} is decidable.*

4.2. Countermodels to some notable failures. An extensive list of the notable failures of PWK can be found in [12]. We present here only some of them so to check how the calculus PWK_{G_3} prevents their derivation and allows to construct

⁵With no loss of generality, we assume that $p, q \in \gamma$ are propositional variables.

a countermodel. In what follows, for simplicity, we take α, β to be propositional variables.⁶

Remark 39 (Modus ponens). $\alpha, \neg\alpha \vee \beta \not\vdash_{\text{PWK}} \beta$.

$$\frac{\frac{\alpha \mid \beta \mid \alpha, \beta}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \mid \beta \mid \beta} \quad \alpha, \beta \mid \beta \mid \beta}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \vee \beta \mid \beta \mid \beta}$$

The non axiomatic propositional sequent is $\alpha \mid \beta \mid \alpha, \beta$ and its propositional variables are α, β . Since $\alpha \notin \Gamma_n$ and $\beta \notin \Gamma_0$ the valuation $v(\alpha) = n, v(\beta) = 0$ gives a countermodel. Indeed $v \not\vdash \alpha, \neg\alpha \vee \beta \mid \beta \mid \beta$.

Remark 40 (Absorption). $\alpha \wedge (\alpha \vee \beta) \not\vdash_{\text{PWK}} \alpha$

$$\frac{\frac{\uparrow}{\alpha, \alpha \vee \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha} \quad \frac{\frac{\uparrow \quad \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha, \beta \quad \alpha, \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha \quad \beta, \beta \mid \alpha \mid \beta}{\alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha \vee \beta} \quad \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha \vee \beta}{\alpha \vee \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha \vee \beta}}{\alpha \wedge (\alpha \vee \beta) \mid \alpha \mid \alpha}$$

The non axiomatic propositional sequent $\beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha, \beta$ describes a countermodel. Since $\alpha \notin \Gamma_0$ and $\beta \notin \Gamma_n$ the valuation $v(\alpha) = 0, v(\beta) = n$ is a countermodel.

Remark 41 (EFQ). $\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha \not\vdash_{\text{PWK}} \beta$

$$\frac{\frac{\alpha \mid \beta \mid \alpha, \beta}{\alpha, \neg\alpha \mid \beta \mid \beta} \quad \alpha \mid \beta \mid \beta \quad \frac{\mid \beta \mid \alpha, \beta}{\neg\alpha \mid \beta \mid \beta}}{\alpha \wedge \neg\alpha \mid \beta \mid \beta}$$

Remark 42 (Conjunction simplification). $\alpha \wedge \beta \not\vdash_{\text{PWK}} \alpha$

$$\frac{\alpha, \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha \quad \alpha \mid \alpha \mid \alpha, \alpha \quad \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha, \beta}{\alpha \wedge \beta \mid \alpha \mid \alpha}$$

Countermodel: $v(\alpha) = 0, v(\beta) = n$.

As concluding remark, we observe that the present framework provides an efficient basis for the comparison between **PWK** and classical logic. Indeed, the sequent calculus for classical logic reduces to a special case of 3-sided sequents, obtained by simply removing the n -component from $\text{PWK}_{\mathbf{G}_3}$. We show the case of $\vee$:

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha, \beta \quad \Gamma_0, \alpha \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \quad \Gamma_0, \beta \mid \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0 \mid \Gamma_1, \alpha \vee \beta} 1\vee =$$

⁶It is not difficult to check that construction of the countermodel would obtain also whenever α, β are complex formulas.

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \alpha, \beta \quad \Gamma_0, \alpha \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \alpha \quad \Gamma_0, \beta \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \alpha \vee \beta} \text{1V} =$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \alpha}{\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \alpha \vee \beta} \text{RV} \quad \frac{\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \beta}{\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Gamma_1, \alpha \vee \beta} \text{RV}$$

In virtue of Theorems 19 and 23, only non-standard (or non quasi-standard) sequent calculi are available options for paraconsistent three-valued logics. Our choice to introduce multi-sided sequents is motivated as this formalism seems capable to capture the non-classical feature of the logical consequence of PWK (see Theorem 1) without speaking of linguistic restrictions, which appear to be internalized within the peculiar structure of sequences.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author acknowledges the EU H2020-MSCA-RISE-2015 project 689176-SYSMICS and the Italian Ministry of Scientific Research (MIUR) for the support within the PRIN project “Theory of Rationality: logical, epistemological and computational aspects.” We finally thank Francesco Paoli for his comments and valuable suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Avron. Natural 3-valued logic: Characterization and proof theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 56(1):276–294, 1991.
- [2] A. Avron. Classical gentzen-type methods in propositional many-valued logics. In *Beyond Two: Theory and applications of multiple-valued logic*, pages 117–155. Springer, 2003.
- [3] A. Avron. Paraconsistency, paracompleteness, gentzen systems, and trivalent semantics. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, 24(1-2):12–34, 2014.
- [4] A. Avron, B. Konikowska, and A. Zamansky. Modular construction of cut-free sequent calculi for paraconsistent logics. In *Proceedings of the 2012 27th Annual IEEE/ACM Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 85–94. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [5] M. Baaz, C. Fermüller, and R. Zach. Systematic construction of natural deduction systems for many-valued logics. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic*, pages 208–13. IEEE Press, 1993.
- [6] M. Baaz, C. G. Fermüller, G. Salzer, and R. Zach. Labeled calculi and finite-valued logics. *Studia Logica*, 61(1):7–33, 1998.
- [7] J. C. Beall. Multiple-conclusion LP and default classicality. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, 4(2):326–336, 2011.
- [8] D. Bochvar. On a three-valued calculus and its application in the analysis of the paradoxes of the extended functional calculus. *Mathematicheskii Sbornik*, 4:287–308, 1938.
- [9] S. Bonzio, J. Gil-Férez, F. Paoli, and L. Peruzzi. On Paraconsistent Weak Kleene Logic. *Studia Logica*, forthcoming.
- [10] S. Bonzio, A. Loi, and L. Peruzzi. A natural duality for involutive bisemilattices. *submitted*.
- [11] W. A. Carnielli. On sequents and tableaux for many-valued logics. *Journal of Non-Classical Logic*, 8(1):59–76, 1991.
- [12] R. Ciuni and M. Carrara. Characterizing logical consequence in paraconsistent weak kleene. In L. Felline, A. Ledda, F. Paoli, and E. Rossanese, editors, *New Developments in Logic and the Philosophy of Science*. College, London, 2016.

- [13] M. Coniglio and M. Corbalán. Sequent calculi for the classical fragment of bochvar and halldén's nonsense logics. *Proceedings of LSFA 2012*, pages 125–136, 2012.
- [14] K. Dyrda and T. Prucnal. On finitely based consequence determined by adistributive lattice. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic*, 9(2):60–67, 1980.
- [15] J. Font. Belnap's four-valued logic and De Morgan lattices. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 5(3):413–440, 1997.
- [16] S. Halldén. *The Logic of Nonsense*. Lundequista Bokhandeln, Uppsala, 1949.
- [17] S. Kleene. *Introduction to Metamathematics*. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1952.
- [18] J. Plonka. On distributive quasilattices. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 60:191–200, 1967.
- [19] G. Priest. The logic of paradox. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 8:219–241, 1979.
- [20] A. Prior. *Time and Modality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1957.
- [21] G. Rousseau. Sequents in many-valued logic. i. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, (60):23–131, 1967.
- [22] R. Zach. *Proof theory of finite-valued logics*. Diploma Thesis, Technical University of Vienna, 1993.

STEFANO BONZIO, UNIVERSITY OF CAGLIARI, ITALY
E-mail address: stefano.bonzio@gmail.com

MICHELE PRA BALDI, UNIVERSITY OF PADOVA, ITALY
E-mail address: m.prabaldi@gmail.com